

**PHOENIX FIELD OFFICE
NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (NEPA)
COMPLIANCE RECORD FOR CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS (CX)**

Proposed Action Title/Type: Right-of-Way Temporary Use Permit/ AZ DOT driveway

NEPA#: AZ-210-2005-0072

Related #: AZA-33041 (Casefile number)

Location of Proposed Action: T. 12 S., R. 6 W., sec. 15, SE¼NE¼NW¼. (USGS Quad Map is *Ajo*.)
Travel to Ajo. The site is on the west side of Highway 85 at the entrance to the Cabeza Prieta National Wildlife Refuge administrative site.

Description of Proposed Action: The Arizona Department of Transportation (AZ DOT) has the right-of-way for Highway 85, they wish to construct a driveway connection to the Cabeza Prieta National Wildlife Refuge administrative site. Arizona Department of Transportation (AZ DOT) proposes a temporary use permit for a driveway into Cabeza Prieta National Wildlife Refuge. The proposed action is to issue a permit for a 1-year term. The area they would be authorized for is 10 feet wide and 30 feet long. This is approximately 0.007 acres in size.

A cultural survey was completed in 1995 entitled *Cultural Resources Survey of A 43 Mile Long Segment of State Route 85*. No significant impacts anticipated.

PART I - PLAN CONFORMANCE REVIEW

This proposed action is subject to the following land use plan: *Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan*. Land cases will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis (page 11). Date approved: June 1988. This proposed action has been reviewed for conformance with this plan (*43 CFR 1610.5-3, BLM Manual 1601.04.C.2*).

PART II - CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION DETERMINATION

A. Verification of Listing: This proposed action qualifies as a categorical exclusion under Department Manual (DM) 516 6, Chapter 11,E. (12). (Grants of right-of-way wholly within the boundaries of other compatibly developed rights-of-way.)

And

B. Exception Review: 516 DM 2.3A(3), Appendix 2 provides for the review of the following criteria to determine if exceptions apply to this project.

IMPORTANT: Appropriate staff should determine exception, comment and initial for concurrence. If exceptions apply to the action or project, and existing NEPA documentation does not address the exception, then further NEPA analysis is required.

NOTE: The comments received from the Phoenix Field Office Natural Resource Specialist (Mr. Tim Hughes), the Phoenix Field Office Outdoor Recreation Planner (Mr. Rich Hanson) and Phoenix Field Office Archaeologist (Ms. Cheryl Blanchard) are attached for reference. I have provided my initial on their behalf as a result of the comments they provided. The comments on the cultural review are based on the original survey completed in 1995

CRITERIA	COMMENT (yes/no)	STAFF INITIAL
1. Has significant adverse effects on public health and safety.	No	LLM (Based on the Attached Comments)
2. Adversely affects unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources, parks, recreation or refuge lands, wilderness	No	LLM (Based on the Attached

areas, wilderness study areas, wild and scenic rivers, sole or principal drinking water aquifers, prime farmlands, wetlands, flood plains, or ecologically significant or critical areas, including those listed on the Department of the Interior National Register of Natural Landmarks.		Comments)
3. Has highly controversial environmental effects.	No	LLM (Based on the Attached Comments)
4. Has highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involves unique or unknown environmental risks.	No	LLM (Based on the Attached Comments)
5. Establishes a precedent for future action or represents a decision in principle about a future action with potentially significant environmental effects.	No	LLM (Based on the Attached Comments)
6. Is related to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant effects.	No	LLM (Based on the Attached Comments)
7. Adversely affects properties listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic places.	No	LLM (Based on the Attached Comments)
8. Affects a species listed or proposed to be listed in the List of Endangered or Threatened Species or adversely affects the species critical habitat.	No	MG (Based on the Attached Comments)
9. Requires compliance with Executive Order 11988 Flood Plain Management, 11990 Protection for Wetlands, or the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act.	No	LLM (Based on the Attached Comments)
10. Threatens to violate a Federal, State, local, or Tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment	No	LLM (Based on the Attached Comments)

PART III - SIGNATURES FOR COMPLIANCE

PREPARER: /s/ Linda L. Mullenix
Linda L. Mullenix, Realty Specialist

DATE: 06/28/2005

REVIEWER: /s/ Jim Andersen
Jim Andersen, Team Lead for Lands & Realty

DATE: 06/28/2005

PART IV - DECISION

I have reviewed this plan conformance and NEPA compliance record and have determined that the proposed project is in conformance with the approved land use plan and that no further environmental analysis is required. It is my decision to implement the project, as described, with the mitigation measures identified below.

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER REMARKS: The temporary use permit will be issued with the standard .

ATTACHMENTS: A location map is attached for reference, in addition to the resource specialist's comments referenced in Part II, page 1.

APPROVING OFFICIAL: Jim Andersen
For Teri Raml, Field Manager

DATE: 06/29/2005